

Criminal Code

• (3:40 p.m.)

Third, by co-operation between the federal and provincial authorities there has to be, I believe a very considerable increase in the number of police officers. In two or three states of the United States in which crime was rampant, as a result of an increase in police personnel there has invariably followed a decrease in crime.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the right hon. gentleman, but I must bring it to the attention of the house that his time has expired unless he has leave to continue. Is it the pleasure of the house to extend the right hon. gentleman's time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I should like to see consideration given by the minister, together with the provincial Attorneys General to, the passing of a federal or provincial law, or a conjoint one, to protect honest businessmen from the intrusion by organized crime in legitimate business by means adopted today in too many cases of extortion, threat and intimidation.

Those are but a few of the recommendations or suggestions I wish to make. What we are trying to do in this house is to bring about improvements. I regret very much that I conclude where I started. So far as the provisions for the legalization of adult homosexuality are concerned, I am opposed. The Prime Minister for a long period of time has advocated that this law is necessary. He said at one time that the law had no place in the bedrooms of the nation. He had some ideas, too, about the subject of freedom of the press. They were uttered in London but they were contrary to that principle. I cannot quite understand why the Prime Minister of Canada would feel it necessary to have the police search and seek out members of the press in regard to their extramural relations.

I find it equally difficult to understand how the Prime Minister could set up—at least I thought this was the suggestion—an order of the crumb. To me that was most unusual. Members of the press were divided into two classes, crumbs and non-crumbs. That is the way famous organizations begin. I would think there would be a widespread desire, in the event that such an order were officially set up, on the part of those in the press for membership in the organization. In any event, that is just an aside.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

What shall I do? I am opposed to these homosexuality amendments. I think they are wrong. I have read the Wolfenden commission report backward and frontward. I know there is no individual more subject to intimidation and threat by the U.S.S.R. as it endeavours to obtain information detrimental to the security of Canada than those who are believed to be homosexuals.

On the ground of conscience I cannot accept the expansion of the law regarding abortion. When it was originally mooted I took it to be much the same as the law which has existed through the years, but it is not. It actually seems to be based on the concept that many abortions are taking place and therefore we ought to legalize them. That is also one of the arguments being advanced regarding homosexuality.

So far as the amendments regarding lotteries are concerned, all of us have our own views. I think the minister has tried his best to bring about suggested amendments which will be generally accepted. In saying that, I cannot personally support the right of the provinces or the dominion to operate lotteries.

Why do we not have a free vote? I cannot understand this. The minister says this is a government measure. Is it something unchangeable like the laws of the Medes and the Persians? Members on the government side know that they do not dare oppose the bill. If they did and the bill was defeated the result would be dissolution unless there was a revamping of the revamping of the constitutional procedure of last February. I read one hon. gentleman's statement yesterday. He said he was in favour of this measure. Another hon. member from Hamilton said that as a result of his Christian teaching he could not accept it. As between those two people, one has qualified to be a minister.

The Prime Minister and the minister say in effect: Support this bill; it is a government measure. To follow that course would be to have legislation by intimidation. Members of this house are not robots to be pushed around and to have their sacred feelings and views of the heart set aside. Members of parliament are not computers into which the Prime Minister puts the message and the computer gives the reply.

Even as I conclude I say to the minister, in the effort he is making to improve the criminal law of our country, do not place the House of Commons in the position that its members will become, as the members of the